

REMARKS

The only issues outstanding in the Office Action mailed April 17, 2008, are the objection to the drawings, and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 102 and 103. Reconsideration of these issues, in view of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Drawings

Replacement sheets of drawings have been provided, removing the objected to Japanese text. In addition, the drawings have been clarified, in order to clarify that roll (1) is a "treatment solution supply" roll. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The only objection in this portion of the Office Action, stated at the top of page 3, is that there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the roll" in line 10 of claim 1. As believed evident from, for example, figure 2, 3 or 4, "the roll" referred to, having ponds of treatment solution both before and after, is the "treatment solution supply" roll. See, for example, claim 2 (reciting "the treatment solution supply roll", figures 2-4, and the description in the specification at page 3, line 22 through 28. Accordingly, reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-3 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Nojima '119. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

It is argued, at page 3 of the Office Action, that Nojima shows, in figure 2, a gel casting method in which a coating solution is added to a roll from above, forming ponds at each side of the roll. It is believed, in this regard, that the Office Action is referencing the aqueous solution of calcium formate (12) used to cause gelling of the base paper (10). However, at the point where

the gelling solution is added, the coating composition has already been applied to the paper, by means of roll coater (11). At any rate, even to the extent that the present treatment solution is equivalent to solution (12) in a reference, it is submitted that a "double pond" method is not disclosed in the reference. First, the reference nowhere indicates that a pond is provided on both sides of the roll beneath solution (12) in the reference. Typically, a treatment solution supply roll turns at high speed, and supply treatment solution is thus brought to the forward side of the treatment solution supply roll, i.e., the side from which the paper is fed. A single pond may be formed at the forward side of the roll in this case. This phenomenon, termed "single pond" method in the present application, see paragraph [0015], is what would typically occur in the reference procedure, where the roll is operated at high speed, as would be typical in the art.

By contrast, a double pond method as claimed herein is not only not disclosed in the reference, but not suggested thereby.

Moreover, attention is directed to comparative examples 1-5 of the present specification, repeating examples 1-5 in accordance with the invention, with the exception that, in the comparative examples, a single pond method was used. The specification demonstrates that, where a double pond method is used, very little edge dust is produced, compared to a large amount of edge dust for the coated papers of the comparative examples. Moreover, as evident from table 1 at page 17 of the specification, the coating properties and gloss of the comparative examples were, on the whole, inferior to those of the double pond method of the invention.

It is accordingly respectfully submitted that the reference, which fails to disclose a double pond method, further fails to suggest one. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 4-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Nojima '119 as above taken with Kuroyama et al. '929. Reconsideration of this rejection is also respectfully requested.

As noted above, Nojima fails to disclose a double pond coating method, as employed in the present claims. As also discussed above, such coating method not only provides significant and unexpected reduction of edge dust, but also improved gloss and coating properties. It is unexpected that such a method would enable such a significant increase in beneficial properties.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the references, or their combination, also fails to suggest the double pond coating method of the invention, and withdrawal of this rejection is also respectfully requested.

The claims of the application are submitted to be in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at the number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Harry B. Shubin/

Harry B. Shubin, Reg. No. 32,004
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: TAKIT-0192

Date: July 17, 2008